

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

ESTATE OF SANDRA VELA, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
COUNTY OF MONTEREY, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-02375-BLF

**ORDER RECONSIDERING DENIAL OF  
PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL; AND  
GRANTING MOTION IN PART AND  
DENYING MOTION IN PART**

[Re: ECF 123]


On July 2, 2018, the Court denied Plaintiffs' administrative sealing motion (ECF 123) with respect to Plaintiffs' Exhibits 56, 82, and 108, three documents which have been designated confidential by the CFMG Defendants.

The Court RECONSIDERS that ruling in light of the Amended Declaration of Adam M. Stoddard (ECF 139) filed on July 3, 2018. Mr. Stoddard states that the CFMG Defendants request sealing only of Exhibit 82, and do not request sealing of Exhibits 56 or 108. Stoddard Decl. ¶ 3, ECF 139. Mr. Stoddard sets forth compelling reasons for sealing Exhibit 82 in its entirety. *See Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1101-02 (9th Cir. 2016). Moreover, the CFMG Defendants' sealing request, which now is limited only to Exhibit 82, is narrowly tailored. *See* Civ. L.R. 79-5(b).

Accordingly, Plaintiffs' administrative sealing motion (ECF 123) is GRANTED IN PART as to Exhibit 82, and DENIED IN PART as to Exhibits 56 and 108.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: July 5, 2018

  
BETH LABSON FREEMAN  
United States District Judge